

# THE REMONSTRANCE

## AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, APRIL, 1918

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,  
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other Publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

### Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and forty-six Branch Committees; 41,300\* members in 443 cities, towns, and villages

MRS. STEPHEN S. FITZGERALD, President	
MRS. THOMAS ALLEN	Acting Vice-
MRS. BENJAMIN A. NORTON	Presidents
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ	
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY	
MISS ANNA L. DAWES	
MRS. LOUIS A. FROTHINGHAM	Vice-
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD	Presidents
MRS. CURTIS GUILD	
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL	
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL	
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY	
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer	
Walnut Street, Brookline	

#### Education and Organization Committee

Chairman

MRS. THOMAS NELSON PERKINS

#### Publicity Committee

Chairman

MRS. HENRY PRESTON WHITE

#### Membership Committee

Chairman

MISS JULIA C. PRENDERGAST

#### Meetings Committee

Chairman

MRS. HAROLD MURDOCK

#### Public Interest League

President

MRS. B. L. ROBINSON

#### College Anti-Suffrage League

President

MRS. HERBERT LYMAN

Recording Secretary

MRS. FRANK FOXCROFT

Corresponding Secretary

MRS. A. H. PARKER

\* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State

MEMBERS ARE EARNESTLY REQUESTED TO KEEP HEADQUARTERS ADVISED OF CHANGES OF ADDRESS.

### AN APPEAL TO "REAL MEN"

At a mass meeting in Baltimore, January 22d, Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., President of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, made a strong appeal to the "real men" of the nation, to stand up for their rights and fight any further concessions that might be asked by the suffragists. She said, amid applause, that no nation could appear in its best light, and no nation could do its best fighting, in time of war, when the men responsible for its government were harassed by a lot of women clamoring for the right to vote, and threatening such men with public and political annihilation when they do get the vote. "Men of America" she said, "you who have to make the machinery of our government, and who are chosen by the people to make that machinery go, I plead with you to stand erect, facing the enemy like men, and not to be intimidated by any body of men or women who seek to hamper you by their demands."

THE REMONSTRANCE borrows Mrs. Wadsworth's phrase and addresses its appeal to the "real men" of Massachusetts.

It asks their immediate, earnest, active and generous cooperation in the effort which patriotic and far-seeing women of Massachusetts—including the great majority of the women of the state, and represented by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts—are making to withstand the efforts of the suffragists to force the responsibilities of the ballot upon them.

THE REMONSTRANCE understands how serious and how complex are the problems which beset the "real men" of the state and the nation

today. There are entirely new problems of business and industry. There are problems of finance, of a magnitude hitherto undreamed of. There are problems of preparation for a world crisis which, five years ago, would have seemed unthinkable. Above all, there is the commanding necessity of making ready, in the least possible time, the strongest possible army, and the most effective possible navy, in order that the United States may "do its bit" in the defence of freedom and humanity, and to make the world safe to live in.

It may well be that many serious and patriotic men are so impressed by these problems that they do not realize that, underlying them all, and outlasting them all, there is the fundamental problem of preserving and strengthening the institutions of government upon which everything else rests. It is these that are threatened by the crusade of the suffragists to "smash through" their program at whatever cost.

It is safe to say that there are hundreds of thousands of "real men" in New York today who bitterly regret that they did not awake in season to the significance of the million-dollar campaign which the suffragists waged, in alliance with the Socialists. They were absorbed in the cares of business and of war activities. They were misled by the emphatic suffrage defeat of two years before. They did not realize the necessity of bestirring themselves. The result is that they find themselves confronted with chaotic conditions, with one half the potential electorate wholly untrained and very largely unwilling, but furnishing abundant material for the Hinky Dinks and Bathhouse Johns of the cities, and,



in its foreign-born element, numbering more than a million women of voting age, "a fertile field for un-American propaganda"—as is pointed out by the National Americanization Committee, which is trying to arouse the people of the State to the peril.

The average woman has only just so much time and strength which, under any circumstances, she can give to public activities. It is a simple matter of mathematics that, if this measure of time and strength is switched off, to politics, to registration and canvassing, to studying public questions and the records of public men, to attendance and work at primaries and at the polls, it cannot be devoted to war relief and kindred activities. Even the suffragists must admit this, unless they are wholly without candor.

Now the question which THE REMONSTRANCE wants to put to the "real men" of Massachusetts is this: Are they ready to exert themselves to avert from the women of their State the calamity which has overtaken the women of New York?

Will they bestir themselves in time, and give practical help in the months immediately before us?

There is need of counsel, cooperation, organization, and financial aid. Are the "real men" ready to give it, and to give it now?

#### "SORRY CALIFORNIA"

The Boston Herald of February 6 published a striking editorial article entitled "Sorry California."

The Herald may have used the adjective to mean that California was sorry for what it had done, or that it was in a sorry plight because of what it had done; but the word would fit its meaning in either case.

The Herald said:

"It has been a long time since there was not something wrong politically with California. The people of the state are now coming to a realization that in flying from old-time evils they threw themselves into the arms of

worse evils—out of the frying-pan into the fire with a vengeance."

It was in 1911 that California took the flying leap to which the Herald refers. In that year the Legislature submitted no less than twenty-three amendments to the state constitution, to be voted on at the same election. The people were wild for Reform, with a capital R. They had been taught to believe that the world could be made over with little difficulty, if proposals looking to that end could only be submitted to the people. So, at a single gulp, the electorate ratified the whole group of amendments. If there had been forty-three instead of twenty-three, probably they would have done the same. They adopted the recall, including the recall of judges, by a majority of 124,360; the initiative-referendum by a majority of 116,651; and other radical proposals by similar majorities. The only proposal which gave them pause was woman suffrage. The fate of the suffrage amendment hung in the balance for days; and, on the official count, it proved to have been carried by a majority of only 3,587.

And how about the millennium which was to have been ushered in, and which now is long overdue? The Herald, an impartial authority, reports that "the state is staggering under a burden of many new commissions, and thousands of deputies and inspectors are swarming over the state to the detriment of all kinds of business. These inspectors and deputies, with salaries from two to six times what they were ever worth in private life, are literally harassing out of existence some of the wholly legitimate industries that they are supposed to help." The Herald goes on to say:

"A Los Angeles paper, with a brutal frankness quite at variance with the usual golden tales that come eastward from that region, tells of hundreds of small property owners who are losing their holdings because they cannot meet the ever-increasing taxes; of the desperate struggle of workers; and of crippled industries. And the whole

thing is traced to the "reform" and "progressive" legislation that California, perhaps more than any other state, has been swallowing, hook, sinker and line."

This is the more significant because California is the one state which is big enough and has had woman suffrage long enough to test its results. In Illinois, women have the presidential and municipal vote, but nothing else worth mentioning, and even that is of doubtful constitutionality. They have had the vote for years in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming and Idaho; but Colorado, the most important of the four, has only about one-third the population of California. The inquirer who wants to know how suffrage is working out will naturally turn to California, with its nearly three million population and more than six years' experience. What he finds is indicated by the foregoing quotations and similar testimony.

In view of this, it will occur to most sane Massachusetts men that, if one is going to look at all, it is better to look before one leaps than afterward.

MRS. LAIDLAW's campaign manual, published by the National Woman Suffrage Publishing Company, contains the following advice as to propaganda: "Any unusual occasion . . . a tragedy, or a crisis, should be seized upon by suffragists to drive home the suffrage lesson." It is in accordance with this advice that the suffragists have seized upon the greatest crisis in American history, when true patriotism demands absolute concentration upon war activities, for harassing Congress and the legislatures, for dividing and weakening the energies of women, and for discrediting the nation by their senseless and selfish agitation. "Suffrage first: America last" seems to be their slogan.

We pride ourselves on America as a democracy. Yet the suffragists admit that they want the Federal amendment in order to avoid submitting the question to the people.



### REPRESENTATIVES AND MIS-REPRESENTATIVES

The very name given to the members of the lower House of Congress implies that they are elected to represent their constituencies.

Yet, in the vote in the House on the Federal suffrage amendment on the 10th of January, a large proportion of the members who voted for the amendment did so in direct opposition to the expressed wishes of their constituents.

Pennsylvania, for example, in 1915, gave a majority of 55,686 against suffrage; but, on the 10th of January, twenty-two out of its thirty-four Representatives saw fit to go counter to this action, and voted for the Federal amendment.

In Missouri, a suffrage amendment was submitted to the voters in 1914 and they rolled up a majority of 140,206 against it. Notwithstanding, when the vote was taken in the House, fifteen out of the sixteen Missouri Representatives voted for the proposal which is meant to override the free action of the voters of the State.

So also in West Virginia. In that State, in 1916, after an active campaign, the voters, by a majority of 98,067, decided that they did not want woman suffrage. But the four Representatives — so-called — from West Virginia, voted solidly for the Federal amendment.

The most surprising instance of all is close at hand. So short a time ago as last September, — only four months before the issue came up in Congress — after a very energetic campaign, in which the suffragists were aided by the urgent endorsement of President Wilson and Col. Roosevelt, and at the close of which they professed themselves absolutely certain of victory, the Maine voters, in city and country alike, defeated the proposed state suffrage amendment by a nearly two-to-one majority. Yet the four Maine Representatives seem to have thought themselves perfectly safe in defying the wishes of their con-

stituencies, and voted solidly for the Federal amendment.

Is it not time that these mis-Representatives were taught that, on a vitally important issue, on which their constituents have expressed themselves plainly, it is not wise for them to flout their wishes? In Maine, in particular, the fall elections, in which, presumably, all four of these Congressmen will go before their constituents asking for re-election, will give an excellent opportunity for teaching this greatly-needed lesson.

### SUFFRAGISTS, PACIFISTS AND THE WAR

Writing in the *London Outlook*, Julia T. Waterman comments, with pardonable plainness of speech, on the claim of American suffragists that they have organized and are organizing "the whole of American women's defence work." She says:

"Woman Suffrage has hindered and obstructed war preparations wherever possible. It was Suffragettes who manned Henry Ford's peace ship. It was America's most celebrated Suffragette, Jane Addams, who led the Anti-Conscription movement in Chicago. It was Suffragettes who caused the riots in Washington on the recent visit of the Russian Mission. On this occasion they nailed a manifesto on the gates of the White House calling on "Kaiser Wilson" to follow Russia's example and give the United States a pure type of democracy.

It is true that the Woman Suffrage Party of New York State preferred discretion to valor and has declared its official opposition to the actions of the White House pickets. It is also true that Mrs. Pankhurst has amended her ways and has decided that after all country comes before party. But her daughters, who belong to a more advanced group, have not shared her repentance. They have been conspicuous, in Australia and elsewhere, in opposing conscription.

Thus we find that wherever women vote pacifism prevails, and that pacifism was the declared policy of the Suffragists in general in regard to national affairs until law, backed by force, became restraint. I do not

for a moment mean to assert that Woman Suffrage is the only cause of pacifism. I believe German propaganda is probably behind all that; but I claim that women have been easily captivated by the melting tones of the envoys of peace, and that every pacifist is inevitably and always a Suffragist. I also contend that the majority of women doing war work in America are not organized by Suffrage societies and are not even interested in the question; especially is this true of those who work without pay. And I point out once more that if the Suffragists had had a vote instead of being merely aspirants for the privilege, there is little room for doubt as to how they would have used it."

THE New York Mail (suffragist) insists that Senator Wadsworth of that State must support the suffrage amendment in the Senate or surrender his seat. It says: "There is no other choice for him. He cannot vote against the amendment and keep his seat in the Senate." The Mail is precipitate. It should remember that suffrage by state action is one thing; suffrage through the coercion of a Federal amendment is another. The latter question was not before the voters at the New York election. The State as a whole, leaving out New York city, where the Socialist-pacifist-suffrage coalition gave the majority for suffrage — voted against state suffrage; and would certainly have voted against Federal suffrage, if that had been the issue.

### SENATOR LODGE'S ATTITUDE

In reply to an appeal, sent to him from Worcester, asking him to support the Susan B. Anthony amendment, Senator Lodge, on the 12th of March, emphatically declared himself opposed to woman suffrage. He wrote:

"I have received your letter and have read what you say in favor of the so-called Anthony amendment. As a result of careful study of the problem, I am opposed to woman suffrage; and in view of this fact, it will be impossible for me to support a constitutional amendment with this object."



### WHAT DOES "TWO-THIRDS" MEAN?

The suffragists seem to have overlooked one point of vital constitutional importance with reference to the Federal suffrage amendment.

This is the question whether, when the United State Constitution says "two-thirds," it means two-thirds, or something less and different.

Article V. of the Constitution, which prescribes the method of amending that instrument, reads: "The Congress, *whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, etc.*"

That seems to be sufficiently plain. What is required for amending the Constitution is, first of all, the affirmative vote of "two-thirds of both Houses"—not two-thirds of those members who may happen to be present at the session when the vote is taken.

There are 435 members of the House of Representatives. Two-thirds of that number is 290. But, when the vote was taken in the House on the 10th of January, only 274 members voted Aye. This was 16 votes less than two-thirds of the total membership. The only way in which it could be interpreted as meeting the constitutional requirement would be by assuming that, when the framers of the Constitution wrote "two-thirds of both Houses" they meant two-thirds of those who happened to be present. What ground is there for such an assumption?

The framers of the Constitution were putting together an instrument which they expected would last for always as the foundation of American institutions. Naturally, they weighed every word carefully. In another Article, when they were directing what should be done by the vote of two-thirds of those present, they said so in unmistakable words. This is in the second section of the Second Article, defining the President's treaty-making powers. This reads: "He shall

have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, *provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.*"

If the framers of the Constitution intended that their language should be exactly followed in the matter of the making of treaties, it is reasonable to suppose that they meant that it should be in the still more important matter of the amending of the Constitution. In the one case, when they said "two-thirds of the Senators present," they meant it; in the other, when they said "two-thirds of both Houses," did they not mean that?

The New York Herald of January 24 editorially urges the wisdom of refraining from any further action upon the Federal suffrage amendment until the constitutionality of the action of the House is established.

### A CURIOUS APPEAL

In a manifesto sent out on the 6th of February, Ida Husted Harper based her appeal for the Federal amendment on this argument:

"It seems as if the men in every state should wish to set their women free from the drudgery of these state campaigns in order that their services might be utilized along the many channels of social welfare where they are so much needed."

But is it not the suffragists who are responsible for forcing the drudgery of these state campaigns upon the women of the country? If these campaigns are a drudgery, and a drain upon the energies of women, which might better be utilized, as Mrs. Harper suggests, "along the many channels of social welfare where they are so much needed," why do Mrs. Harper and her associates insist on pushing them at a time like this? That is the real question.

The great majority of the women of this country are eager to devote all their strength to patriotic activities. They look upon everything else as an interruption and a distraction. They have no time or

desire to study questions of local politics; still less to have any personal share in such politics, or the nomination or election of candidates. They would rather not hear the word "suffrage" until the war is over.

It is the suffragists who introduce and push this disturbing and divisive question, and who deliberately take advantage of the general absorption of American men and women in patriotic services, and describe this as "the time of times" to push through their proposals.

An interesting incident of the city election at Seattle, Washington, on the 6th of March, was the recall from office, by an overwhelming vote, of Miss Annie Louise Strong, member of the School Board, because of her opposition to the draft.

THERE are few British statesmen or diplomatists so universally respected, on both sides of the Atlantic, as Lord Bryce. He is as far as possible from being a hide-bound Conservative. The Saturday Review aptly describes him as "a philosophic Radical." Yet, when the suffrage proposal was before the House of Lords, in the so-called Representation of the People bill, Lord Bryce said that there was no evidence that the nation, or even the women, desired the enfranchisement of six million women. He added:

"The immense majority of women are not qualified by their way of life, by their knowledge, and by the interest they take in public affairs, to use the vote to their advantage and that of the nation. No sufficient reason has been shown why we, with all the large and difficult problems, national and imperial, that now confront us, should, without any expression of the people's will, be the first great nation to launch out into what for us is a wide and uncharted sea."

These are days when all American women should be united in war activities. Is it wise to divide them by forcing the suffrage issue at such a time?



### THE SOCIALIST MENACE

Apparently, the New York suffragists are awaking, though somewhat tardily, to the menace to the state and city involved in the success of the Socialist-suffrage alliance.

Through The Woman Citizen they have made frantic efforts to disavow this alliance; but they cannot dispose of the fact that, outside of New York city, the state voted against suffrage, and that, in New York city, the mere gain in the Socialist vote was larger than the suffrage majority. This means that, except for this phenomenal Socialist gain, all of which went to the suffrage side, the suffrage amendment would have been buried. Also, the suffragists would like the public to believe that the Socialist-suffrage vote was not a pro-German, anti-war vote; but here again they are confronted by the fact that the chief asset of the Socialist candidate for Mayor was his opposition to the draft, and his refusal to buy a Liberty Bond, and that his canvassers at the polls were women wearing sashes bearing the words: "Have mercy on your wife and family. Vote the straight Socialist ticket."

Now that the mischief is done, some at least of the suffragists are inclined to cooperate with the efforts of the National Americanization Committee to enlighten and Americanize the hundreds of thousands of ignorant foreign-born women upon whom the full privileges of citizenship have been suddenly conferred. An urgent appeal sent out by the Americanization Committee on the 15th of January emphasizes this menace thus:

"Many thousands of women born in foreign lands will vote at the next election in this State, which is the most important strategic point on the Atlantic Coast.

*Whether new women voters will support the government in this world war will depend largely upon whether native-born Americans will undertake the task of Americanization or*

*whether they will leave it to anti-American Socialists.*

*The recent vote for Hillquit hoists the danger signal in plain sight."*

The same Committee, in an appeal sent out from the headquarters of the New York State Woman Suffrage Party, directs attention to the fact that in 1910 there were 291,598 foreign-born women unable to speak English in New York State, and that 224,982 of them were in New York city; and that there were 198,679 foreign-born women in the State absolutely illiterate in any language, 147,857 of whom were in New York city. The Committee adds: "Many of these immigrant women voters are so ignorant of America that they fail utterly to understand the real American purpose in this war—or why America should be at war at all. *They do not understand the American part in the world war for democracy, and help immeasurably to create a sentiment against it.*"

This menace is so serious that it should engage the efforts of every patriotic citizen to meet it; but the suffragists cannot expect that it will be forgotten how it came about.

### A SUFFRAGIST WHO KEPT HIS WORD

The Cambridge Equal Suffrage Club, on the 22d of January, voted that it was its unanimous desire "to register its disapproval of Congressman Dallinger's vote against the Susan B. Anthony amendment" and that "this board absolutely disputes Congressman Dallinger's sophistical statement in the press to evade responsibility upon this great issue, and desires to inform the Congressman that this board will from now on be actively opposed to his re-election as unfit to represent this great district in a nation which prides itself on its present struggle for real democracy."

And what was it that called down upon Congressman Dallinger this scathing denunciation and promise of

revenge? Simply this, that he had given his word, and he kept it. He was personally a suffragist by conviction and he had made no concealment of the fact. But he believed that a prime function of a Representative is to represent his constituency. When, in his campaign in 1916, his attention was called to the fact that, in the previous year, the voters of his city, county, district and state had rejected woman suffrage by a majority of two to one or more, he declared his intention, in spite of his personal views, to represent his constituents upon this question, until he had clear evidence that their attitude had changed. No such evidence was in sight when the vote was taken in the House of Representatives on the 10th of January. He therefore resisted all pressure from every suffrage quarter, and kept his word. And, for this offence, suffragist though he is, the suffragists advertise their purpose to defeat him if possible next November.

Evidently, the Cambridge Equal Suffrage Club holds it a far less serious offence to lie to the voters than to disappoint the suffragists.

THE character and temper of the New York city Socialists, who gave the city and State over to the suffragists, are clearly shown in the fact that the seven Socialist aldermen, on the 26th of February, vehemently and unanimously opposed a resolution for assisting in the sale of war savings stamps. The Socialist leader, Alderman Lee, declared that this is a rich man's war, and the rich man should pay for it. It must be disquieting to some suffragists to reflect that the success of the suffrage amendment has doubled the vote behind these men.

Anti-suffrage women have repeatedly tried, in different States, to have the suffrage question submitted to the women. The suffragists have always opposed them. Isn't this a confession that the majority of women do not want the vote?



## DOING THEIR BIT

All over the country, anti-suffrage women are giving their time and strength to all forms of war relief and war activity. They are doing their bit in response to the calls of patriotism, and for the encouragement and comfort of the boys who are fighting for freedom and humanity on the battlefields of Europe. It has never occurred to them to advertise their activities, or to link them, in the society columns of the newspapers, with their identification with the anti-suffrage cause.

The Boston Herald has recently called attention to two conspicuous instances of this self-denying devotion to the patriotic demands of the hour.

One is that of Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, for years Chairman of the Education and Organization Committee of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts, who, since the United States entered the war, has been engaged daily at the State House as the head of the Soldiers' Bureau of Information, in the Adjutant-General's office, making up a roster of Massachusetts men in the service, and organizing relief work.

The other is that of Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, for years President of the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association, and at present Vice-President both of the State and the National Associations, who has gone with her husband to Paris, where they have bought a house to be used as a Bureau of Information for Massachusetts soldiers. Mrs. Frothingham, with her co-workers, will make this house a place where every Massachusetts soldier may feel at home, and where he may obtain information regarding those whom he has left behind.

## THE NEED OF WOMEN

The Woman Citizen of Jan. 26 said editorially:

"Such convinced anti-suffragists as ex-President William Howard

Taft and Dr. Talcott Williams do not see anything funny in their serious determination to call upon the womanhood of the nation for help in the aims of the League. Its Committee of Management has projected a campaign among women to strengthen opposition to a premature peace and to promote the formation, after the war, of a league of nations."

The prime reason why convinced anti-suffragists do not see anything funny in this call is that there is not anything funny in it. The activities to which ex-President Taft and his associates invite "the womanhood of the nation" are precisely those in which women are needed, and they are activities with which the ballot has nothing whatever to do. Also, they are activities which must necessarily be restricted precisely in proportion to the extent to which women, in New York or elsewhere, find themselves compelled to give their time to politics to offset, so far as they can, the new recruits of the Morris Hillquits, the Hinky Dinks, and the Bathhouse Johns.

ACCORDING to the Chicago correspondent of the New York Evening Post (suffragist), the Thompson regime in that city "has been going from bad to worse." He cites recent conspicuous instances of spoilsism, including the Mayor's veto of an order providing for an investigation of city departments with a view to economies and greater efficiency, and reaches the conclusion: "Chicago is 'Council-governed,' and, if it elects a poor Council and a worse Mayor, what can it expect in the way of administration?" It would have expected a great deal, if it had taken stock in the promises of the suffragists; for 61 per cent. of the Chicago women who voted gave their votes to Mayor Thompson. Thompson, by the way, will be long remembered as the one American whose pro-Germanism carried him so far as to lead him to be flagrantly discourteous to Marshal Joffre.

CONDITIONS at Vallejo, California, a city where women have had a chance to exert their uplifting influence for years through the vote, are so bad that the commandant at Mare Island has been forced to limit the "liberty" of men to that city to actual residents or those whose families are there. A German brewer, according to the commandant, is reputed to control not only the saloons but the municipal government.

APROPOS of the oft-repeated suffrage statement that the saloons and other sinister interests defeat woman suffrage, John W. Puddy, writing in the New York World, directs attention to the fact that, in New York last November, "The largest vote and majorities for Woman Suffrage were given in the cities in the liquor strongholds. In other words, it was not the total abstainers, but the drinkers, who gave the vote to the women of New York State."

THE Woman Citizen — always distinguished for its courtesy toward those who differ from it — has found a new term to describe them. They are, it appears, "masked bandits striking in the dark." It must be melancholy for The Woman Citizen to reflect that these "masked bandits" outnumber, by a good many million, its own followers; and that they include a great majority of the best and most useful women in the country.

HON. Wilfred W. Lufkin, who represents the Sixth Massachusetts district in the House of Representatives, in his speech on the 10th of January in opposition to the Federal Suffrage Amendment, said:

"My opposition to the passage of this resolution is based solely and entirely on the fact that in my opinion this is no time to be trying an experiment of such tremendous magnitude as the granting of the franchise to millions and millions of new voters."

The suffragists claim the ballot as a reward for services which they expect to render. Is it just to reward them at the cost of penalizing the great majority of women who do not want the vote?



## SUFFRAGE CAMOUFLAGE

The suffragists profess to be immensely pleased with the result of the special elections for Congress in four New York city districts on the 5th of March.

Miss Young, editor of the *Woman Citizen*, points to the elections as proof that "women want to vote and do vote"; and Miss Hay, chairman of the New York City Woman Suffrage Party, says that the woman voters "voted in large numbers, 99 per cent. of those who registered going to the polls and casting their ballots."

But Miss Young should explain why it was that, if women want to vote and do vote, barely one-fourth of the women in these four districts who were qualified to register and vote took the trouble to do so. And this in spite of the concerted and strenuous efforts of the suffragists to get the largest possible number of women to the polls, in order to demonstrate the thirst of women for the ballot.

In these four districts, at the last Congressional election, in November, 1916, the total vote polled was 121,070. On the 5th of March, the total vote polled was only 78,192—men and women. Of these, 31,858 votes were cast by women. This is but a trifle more than one-quarter of the votes actually cast by men in these districts in 1916.

As to Miss Hay's boast, that is the familiar suffrage camouflage. It was to be taken for granted that the women who took the trouble to enrol and register would go to the polls and vote. The comparatively light vote of the men is accounted for by the absence of the issues which specially appealed to them in 1916. The *New York Evening Post*, suffrage organ though it is, rebukes the suffrage claim when it says:

"The statement that 90 per cent. of the women registered voted, while only 33 per cent. of the men did so, must be qualified by the explanation that the women had registered for this election, while the men's registration was for the Presidential contest."

The one striking fact about the elections—to which neither Miss Young nor Miss Hay thinks it wise to call attention—is that while, in each of the four districts, the Democratic and Republican votes fell off materially, *the Socialist vote was larger in every district.* In the Seventh district, the Socialist vote was *four times as large as in 1916.* In the Eighth district, it was *one and a half times as large.* In the other two districts, the gain in the Socialist vote was smaller; but it was sufficient in the Twenty-second district to give the Socialist candidate the second place in the list, while the Republican candidate, whose vote was less than one-quarter of the Republican vote of 1916, dropped to the third place. Evidently, the Socialist-suffrage alliance is working well.

THE Massachusetts Senate, on the 28th of February, by a vote of 23 to 15, defeated a bill to give license suffrage to women.

## THE AMERICAN BOLSHEVIKI

(Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, President National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, in *New York Times*, Mar. 2, 1918)

The only dangerous domestic enemies in this country are what is known as "The American Bolsheviki." They have votes, and it is planned to give their women votes—while the conservative women protest against votes and largely fail to cast votes when given the franchise.

The so-called "Woman's Party" is politically a myth. There is no "solidarity of sex," no "woman's vote" to be delivered by any of the suffrage leaders. The only solidarity connected with the granting of woman suffrage is the doubling of the solid radical vote, while the conservative vote is divided and relatively decreased.

The question is no longer one of woman against woman, or woman against man, but of protecting American institutions against the organized radicals of both sexes.

If Congress will give us a fair chance, if the press will give us the opportunity to tell the facts, we anti-suffrage women of America feel confident that we can pledge ourselves to protect this country from "votes for

women" and can segregate this menace in the States where it exists until its repeal is eventually demanded.

Eighty per cent. of the women of this country are wives and mothers. The majority of them would rather be represented at the polls by the fathers of their children than misrepresented in Congress or the Legislatures by any woman politician.

## A CHANGE THAT MAKES FOR WEAKNESS

(From the *London Morning Post*, Jan. 8, 1918)

Under the Representation of the People Bill six million women are to be added to the electorate. In other words, this country, in the midst of the sternest fight it ever fought, is to make a change in its government which cannot make for strength and must make for weakness. This change is being made not in response to any national need or even to any national demand; but because certain politicians who know they have been found out by the men who trusted them desire to exploit a new layer of innocence and credulity. They make this change not in the hope of making the electorate better, but of making it worse, not of making it stronger, but of making it weaker. It is designed to swamp the voter who has political experience and sagacity and to substitute an electorate which will apply a new faith to the old lies. This manœuvre is being carried out behind the backs of the men of the nation who deserve most to be considered and whose interests are most at stake. It is a change on which their opinion ought at least to be asked, since it dilutes and weakens their rights in the government of their country. And we might say, without exaggeration, that it practically disfranchises them, for it recognizes a principle which is not likely to stop with the measure which embodies it, but will be developed to its logical conclusion, which is that the majority of over two million adult women over men which now exists in this country will in the end govern it.

Conditions of suffrage have always been determined by each State for itself. What reason is there for forcing woman suffrage upon States which do not want it and whose voters have repeatedly voted against it?



### A REVOLT AGAINST SUFFRAGE

At a meeting in Albany in January, attended by anti-suffrage women representing twenty-six counties, resolutions were unanimously adopted calling for organized effort to secure a resubmission of the suffrage question to the voters.

The preamble to the resolutions set forth the fact that the suffrage amendment was carried by default, and by the foreign, pacifist, Socialist vote of New York city, and that it was New York city that imposed suffrage upon the State. It recalled the fact that a referendum to women had frequently been urged in order that women should determine whether the ballot should be conferred upon them, but that this had always been opposed by suffragists; and, affirming that it was only reasonable that women be now afforded this opportunity, it declared: "We, the enfranchised women of New York who oppose woman suffrage, demand a resubmission of this measure in order that now, at last, women may register their will upon this question."

In February, the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage merged itself in a new organization, the Anti-Suffrage Party, the purpose of which is to enrol and concentrate the non-radical vote, and to resist the Socialist attack upon American institutions, and especially to secure the resubmission of the suffrage question.

If the suffragists were consistent, they would approve this movement of the anti-suffragists to make immediate use of the ballot; and they would not oppose them in their effort to secure a state-wide expression of the voters, men and women, upon the suffrage question.

The proposal of the New York anti-suffragists offers the best opportunity ever given to test the real feeling of women regarding the ballot. Hitherto, whenever a referendum of women upon the question has been proposed, it has

always been possible to say that it would be nothing more than a "straw vote," and would have no practical result. But this cannot be said of the New York proposal. If the suffrage amendment there is resubmitted, the result will be conclusive. It will either reaffirm the action of last November, and put woman suffrage in that state beyond dispute; or it will repeal the amendment, and prove that the Socialist-suffrage alliance which was responsible for it did not truly represent the wishes of the people, women or men. How can the suffragists oppose the proposal without virtually admitting that they are afraid of the result?

### COUNTING THE COST

The authorities in New York are only just beginning to count the cost of woman suffrage. Merely to enrol the women voters in New York city, to admit of their participation in the primaries, will cost \$212,700, according to figures submitted by Elections Commissioner Jacob A. Livingston. But this is only one small item in the total cost, which must be multiplied several times to cover the added cost in the State.

There are now about 5,700 election districts in the State. Under the new order of things, 9,000 will be needed. Merely to man these districts will cost about \$50 each on both registration and election days. This will add \$330,000. Altogether, two million dollars a year is a moderate estimate of the additional cost of town, city and state elections by reason of women's votes.

But this money cost of additional election machinery is a small matter by comparison with what the community will have to pay for the consequences of opening the polls to an untrained electorate at the most critical moment in the nation's history.

### WHERE IS THE PROOF?

Miss Jeannette Rankin, writing in the New York American of Feb. 1, said:

"With the power of the ballot, the New York woman has no excuse for allowing hundreds of young girls to disappear every year from the city streets into oblivion. She has no excuse for allowing little children to be surrounded by conditions which lead them to the detention homes and worse."

Is it not about time that the suffragists, instead of incessantly predicting great moral results from woman suffrage in cities and states where it has not been tested, should cite a few definite facts and figures from communities where women have been voting for years? How about Denver? Or Seattle? Or San Francisco? And, especially, how about Chicago, where the prevailing conditions are unspeakable and are growing worse from year to year?

By a vote of 42 to 30, the Maryland House of Delegates, March 13, defeated a presidential suffrage bill; and then, adopting a motion to lay on the table a motion to reconsider, definitely killed the bill for the session.

### Prize Contest

The Advisory Board of the Massachusetts College Women's Anti-Suffrage League offers its members a prize contest (first prize \$25; second, \$15; third, \$10) for the best papers on the following topics. Other Anti-Suffrage standpoints acceptable if preferred.

1. Does the Patriotic Service of Women furnish a Suffrage Argument?
2. Show that Prohibition does not depend upon Woman Suffrage.
3. Show that the Federal Amendment to Enfranchise Women Nationally is in direct opposition to the Democratic principle of majority rule.
4. Analyse the Alliance of Pacifism, Socialism and Woman Suffrage.

The papers shall not exceed 3,000 words and shall be received no later than May 1st, 1918.

Abundant information may be found at the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage headquarters, 687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

All Anti-suffrage college women, resident in Massachusetts, eligible for membership in the League.

Address inquiries and papers to Mrs. Herbert Lyman, above address.